

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant's undersigned representative would like to thank the Examiner for granting the personal interview conducted on April 16, 2007. In the interview Applicant's representative explained to the Examiner how each of the limitations of claims 1, 3 and 10 were disclosed in the application as filed. The Examiner agreed to reconsider the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph in view of this explanation which is summarized below.

With reference to claim 1, the specification as originally filed discloses a "housing having a base part and a plurality of modules being releasably mounted to said base part via a hinge part." On page 9, lines 19-24, the specification explains that a basic housing (3) is provided with a battery compartment (29). As described on page 11, lines 16-21, it is explained that a plug-in part (34) of an extra module (51) is plugged into the battery compartment (29). As further described on page 12, lines 4-9, the extra module (51) is releasably mounted via snap-on part (43a) and snapping part (46a).

On page 12, lines 2-4, it is described that a plurality of extra modules (51) can be stacked on the basic module. Also, on page 3, lines 21-24, it is stated that "according to this principle, more than one surface-mounted module can be coupled modularly to the actual body of the device, in practice extending the hook-shaped body of the device." Since each extra module (51) has its own battery compartment (29a), as described on page 11, line 24 to page 12, line 2, one of ordinary skill in the art would readily appreciate that additional extra modules (51) would be stacked one behind the other (as implied on page 12, lines 2-4) by simply inserting the plug-in part (34) of each additional extra module (51) into the battery compartment (29a) of the previous extra module (51). In further support of the fact that an additional extra module (51) could be attached to the battery compartment (29a) of a previous extra module (51) is that the battery compartment (29a) appears to have substantially the

same physical structure as the battery compartment (29) which is explicitly described as receiving the plug-in part (34) of the extra module (51). For example, it is described on page 11, lines 24-25, the compartment (29a) receives the same battery (33) that was taken out of the battery compartment (29). Also, as described on page 11, line 26 to page 12, line 2 the extra module (51) receives that cover (39) that was removed from the battery compartment (29). Thus, as illustrated by these examples, the physical structure of the extra module (51) and its battery compartment (29a) is substantially the same as the structure of the basic housing (3) and its battery compartment (29).

With further reference to claim 1, the specification as originally filed discloses “one of said plurality of modules being a wireless signal transmission module and another one of said plurality of modules being a battery compartment module.” Specifically, on page 11, the specification recites: “There is often a desire to equip this basic configuration with more options, for example with *an interface unit for wireless signal transmission* of a programming plug-in unit, another audio input, *a larger storage battery compartment*, a mechanical activating unit, etc.” Also, on page 5, lines 18-24 the specification states: “The modules preferably used as surface-mounted modules are modules for a *wireless communication interface* or a plug adapter module to adjust the hearing aid or other acoustic/electric transducer arrangements, *a storage battery module*, which is usually built bigger than the battery cells usually used, a programming module or a mechanically activated module.”

With reference to claim 3, the specification as originally filed discloses on page 3, lines 16-20 that “applying said module having a battery compartment to said base part establishes electric feed to said base part,” as claimed.

With reference to claim 10, the specification as originally filed discloses that “each of said plurality of modules is adapted for snap-locking.” Specifically, on page 12, lines 4-9, it is described that the extra module (51) is releasably mounted via snap-on part (43a) and snapping part (46a).

As described in detail above, every limitation of claims 1, 3 and 10 was supported by the disclosure at the time the application was filed. Therefore Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 31856US3.

Respectfully submitted,
PEARNE & GORDON, LLP

By: /Aaron A. Fishman/
Aaron A. Fishman – Reg. No. 44,682

1801 East 9th Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700

May 24, 2007